

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

17935

later. He has since served on the board of managers for Washington State Pharmaceutical Association, and was an organizer of the Pierce County Pharmaceutical Association. He is located in Tacoma.

PRESIDENT REXALL CLUBS INTERNATIONAL

Long recognized for his driving energy and imagination, Art Boyle was fittingly elected president of the International Association of Rexall Clubs for the Diamond Jubilee Year, 1963, succeeding J. B. McCaleb, of Savannah, Tenn. In that capacity, he rules over Rexall Clubs in 47 States and 7 foreign countries—upward of 12,000 Rexall stores. Art has been part of the Rexall family since 1919. The IARC was established 48 years ago to provide a common meeting ground for the exchange of ideas among Rexallites and to help them further community service through supplying health needs to the public. Art Boyle, as president, flies 100,000 miles a year throughout the United States and Europe, delivering lectures.

FAMILY MAN—CIVIC LEADER

Art Boyle has been married to the former Edith LeLoupe, of Buckley, for 33 years. They are the parents of four sons—a trucking executive, two teaching school, one in the Air Force. His outside activities include Serra International, Knights of Columbus, Mountain View Sanitarium, and working with the Boys Club.

ART BOYLE SPEAKS OUT

Excerpts from his speeches—on longevity:

In the time of ancient Rome, a new-born child's life expectancy was only 22 years. Today it is 70 years—and by the year 2150 it'll be 150. This increase in life expectancy can be credited to our medical research explosion. Why, 7 of 10 prescriptions filled today were not even available 10 years ago. The combined efforts of doctors, pharmacists, nurses, hospitals, university, and industry research scientists and drug manufacturers have dramatically reduced children's deaths, maternity deaths, deaths from infectious diseases, and polio deaths. We're living in a fantastic era.

On drug costs:

For years drugs in the United States top those of any other country in quality and safety, yet—and get this—do you realize that the typical American spends 25 cents of each dollar he earns on food and tobacco, 25 cents on housing, 10 cents on clothing and jewelry—and only 1 cent of each dollar on drugs?

On college scholarships:

As a product of the school of hard knocks—where you go out and earn your own education—I am dead set against giving money for college scholarships. I'd rather see a program devised whereby a student could apply for a loan, using it to go to college, and paying it back after graduation and he is earning money. In short, I'm against free rides. I want the student to appreciate his education and to earn it.

On Rexall self-identification:

The first rule of merchandising is to have a good place to sell your merchandise. Now what's your drug store. Let's stop and take a look at it. Is it neat, clean, well-lighted, departmentalized, with adequately arranged displays? Mass displays at featured spots, spacious aisles? This is what your customers

see in competitive supermarkets—this is what they want. This is what you'll have to try to give them. Is your store identified as a Rexall Store so that when the public reads or listens to our ads they'll know where and when to go to buy Rexall products? Year after year you spend a lot of your own money (and more of Rexall's) to advertise your store, Rexall products, and sundries. All this flows down the drain if you're not identified as a Rexall Store.

On salesmanship:

A successful salesman must be enthusiastic, intelligent, congenial, imbued with the power of positive thinking—one that people will drive miles to do business with. He is a person who forms a habit of doing the things other salesmen don't like to do. Remember the three H's—happy, hobby, habit. Form the habit of doing the hobby you are happy to do. It pays off in sales.

On organization:

This is the age of organization—trade unions, fraternal orders, social clubs, kids' programs—everything from the AFL-CIO to the Blue Birds. All this adds up to only one answer for today's independent druggist. He'll either organize or be ostracized. Here is my proof: on the avenue where I operate my McKinley Hill store, less than 15 years ago there were 34 independent businesses; now there are only 4 still open. If the independent is to survive it must organize with other independents or lose out to chain giants.

Mr. Speaker, this ideal for Free Enterprise Day has been noted by 20 Governors of America. There are 13 who have proclaimed a Free Enterprise Day in their States. My record may not be complete but from a good source I find the following Governors who have issued a special proclamation in which they give endorsement to and encouragement to free enterprise and Free Enterprise Day: Frank G. Clement, Tennessee; Carl E. Sanders, Georgia; Frank B. Morrison, Nebraska; Bert Combs, Kentucky; J. Millard Tawes, Maryland; John M. Dalton, Missouri; Paul J. Fannin, Arizona; Terry Sanford, North Carolina; Albert D. Rosellini, Washington. I am sure there are others. In fact I am sure that every Governor in the States believes in our free enterprise system.

I am glad to have this opportunity to speak for, to aid and abet, and to otherwise encourage the extension of every freedom that we cherish as American and especially the free enterprise system that has done so much for so many people here in our country and has given freedom-loving people everywhere so much hope and encouragement.

(Mr. BELL (at the request of Mr. SCHWENGEL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, our forefathers left us a great legacy. Individual initiative and self-reliance are qualities which we, as Americans, have inherited. Such traditions are much more than mere abstractions—they are reflected in every facet of our society. Free enterprise is a prime example—a system of economic organization which best captures the basic spirit of man. Every living thing strives for freedom. Foremost within man's nature is his natural disposition to remain free, to exercise

his free will. It is contrary to the nature of man to subjugate himself to an ironclad regimen, to totalitarian discipline.

The great test of our time is the clash and competition among ideologies. In addition to being a political system communism is an economic system—one with which the leaders of the Communist world have threatened to bury us through economic warfare. Our form of economic organization—that of free enterprise—is now on trial for its life.

Time and human experience have given trial to many grand and not so grand economic designs through the ages. Another chapter in that competition is being written at this very moment.

Individual initiative and the profit motive provide incentive lacking in the sterile environment of an impersonal state-owned and state-directed regime. The vigor of the competitive free enterprise economy is self-generated, not the product of artificial incentives from without or fear of reprisal.

America has a free enterprise economy. The productive energy of our great system has given us a level of economic and material prosperity never before attained. The productive power and the creative genius of the American adventure into a free enterprise economy provides an example for other freedom-loving people.

Today, within the Iron Curtain countries, the inevitable winds of discontent and unrest are beginning to blow. As prosperity and living conditions steadily improve in these countries, independence awakens. This is not to claim that these peoples necessarily want a government or a life exactly like ours. However, there is no question that they are beginning to realize the existence of and yearn for the freedom which we take as a fact of life. Even today there are reassuring signs that the yoke of tight control may be supplanted by a larger measure of personal freedom—because their governments have no choice.

The American example of industrial might and productivity has been realized through the vigor of free competition. Free enterprise is our blessing, and too infrequently we give recognition to the principles which have made this Nation truly great. Formal recognition by the establishment of a Free Enterprise Day is, therefore, fitting and proper.

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN (at the request of Mr. SCHWENGEL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I take particular pleasure in associating myself today with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] and the other gentlemen commenting on private enterprise. It seems to me to be altogether appropriate—perhaps even getting somewhat late—for the Members of this body to lean back and look at freedom, individual initiative and free enterprise with studied perspective.

Are we keeping our freedoms—the backbone of our Republic—intact? Or

17936

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 7

are they being eroded? Do we have complete freedom except in areas where it might do harm to others, or are we now restricting freedom in areas where some bureaucrat—perhaps erroneously—decides it may be in the public interest?

Are we encouraging free enterprise by word and deed, or are we stifling it by more and more restrictive regulations and by injecting the government and taxpayer dollars into competition with private business?

One of the first impacts Washington has on a new Congressman is that our government is big. Big in interests, big in costs, and big in plans and performance. For instance, if our national debt reaches the anticipated peak of \$320 billion, as our fiscal planners estimate, it will have increased \$37 billion in 3 years—a frightening 1 billion a month since January of 1961.

In June of this year, at the end of the current fiscal year, the Federal Government had \$87 billion in appropriated but unspent Federal funds, and it is asking for almost a hundred billion more for next year. And, the Government has added almost 200,000 more employees.

These are accepted facts of life in Washington, swallowed with satisfaction or regurgitated in anger, depending mostly on the political philosophy that motivates the man who has to face the facts in Congress.

They exist and there is no avoiding them. They exist alongside the fact that we have a finger in almost every international pie on the globe, and we are now reaching for the pie that is supposed to be in the sky and on the moon.

They exist alongside the fact that we are a growing nation—our cities have been exploding—our population racing toward the 200 million mark—spurred on with considerable impetus. I might add, by that remarkable mother in South Dakota and her spectacular demonstration of fertility.

Perhaps as a newcomer in Washington I am fortunate. I have had an opportunity to look at many of these Federal functions with some detachment because they are a going concern and the question is not whether they are particularly good or bad, but where they are leading us as a nation.

Just 53 years ago we were a nation of less than 100 million people. Many of you will agree that you were little concerned with Washington and that Washington was little concerned about you and you got along all right. There was little Federal regulation, little Federal coercion and little Federal money trickling down.

Today, as we near the 200 million mark in population, Federal interest in our affairs has not doubled as our population, it has increased ten thousand fold.

Why, as we grow more numerical, must we grow more rigidly regulated in our personal affairs? Why is there a numerical limit on our personal liberty—and will it grow more rigid when we are 300 or 500 million Americans? I do not know, but I spend a good deal of my time and thoughts on trying to find out, because it is a fact that this grasp for power is increasing.

In the entire session of the 87th Congress the President made 88 requests for Federal spending and 29 requests for increased Executive powers. In the first 6 months of the current Congress—the 88th—the President has made 207 requests for money and 70 requests for increased Executive power. Herein lies the underlying point of contention in the debate recently on the tax bill. All of us were for the tax cut and 155 of us wanted a positive program of expenditure control so we could afford the tax cut.

I do not, I repeat, point to these facts other than to state that they are facts and we must be deeply aware of them. I cannot condone their existence or herald their virtues as some do. I simply think it is time for all of us to examine them in detail.

And when we have done this, we should rededicate ourselves to the encouragement of our citizens to a program of self-sufficiency and a lesser dependence upon the superficial resources of the Federal Government. As we advance toward a program of orderly progress, it is more important than ever that we abide by the basic concepts of our competitive free enterprise system and work to strengthen it in order to meet the major economic competition throughout the world.

All we need do is to pull the bit out of the mouth of the private enterprise system—by making increased rewards for initiative the accepted practice—and our Nation will run with a free head out of our present economic crisis.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, may I commend the distinguished and able gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL) for his great tribute to our free enterprise system. The free enterprise system is the very foundation stone of the American way of life. It fosters private property, initiative, independence, and individual rights. The American free enterprise system carved out of the most undeveloped continent in the world the most highly developed and productive civilization in all history. The free enterprise system in the United States made of us the arsenal of democracy in war and since the war we have furnished the whole world with much of its food and fiber.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was simply the profit motive, the capitalistic system that gave to this Nation the highest wages and best working conditions in the history of the world. Our working men and women have over half of the world's automobiles, over half of the world's radios and television sets, washing machines, and so forth. We have the best medicare, best hospitalization programs, and best library system, finest roads, telephones, and railroad system on the face of the earth. We have more churches than the rest of the world combined.

This is the story we need to tell the world. Africa, South America, and Asia need this dynamic, progressive, economic philosophy to get their own economy moving.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND
REMARKS

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Members who desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the subject I have just discussed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

SOUTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I throw up my hands in despair over the recent events in the unfortunate country of South Vietnam. The unresolved issues in that strategic nation amount to increasing concern for all of the free nations in the world face to face with the increasing Communist designs in the area.

With millions of Americans, I am disturbed with the worldwide wanderings of the would-be first lady of the land, the sister of President Diem, Madame Nhu.

This charming lady, Mr. Speaker, is one of the potentially dangerous political figures in the world today.

What is tragic is that with all of our problems with enemies she has managed to become one of the greatest. At the same time, the country for which unfortunately she has become the spokesman has been the beneficiary of great amounts of economic and military aid.

What has she done to thank us? She has insulted the President of the United States, the presence of U.S. military troops and almost everybody else under the rising and setting sun.

She has become a thorn in the fight for democracy around the world and we are beginning to treat her as a world figure of importance, which is precisely what she wants. No one in recent history has captured the imagination of the press in various parts of the world to the extent that this shrew has.

What I want to know, Mr. Speaker, is this:

How long is the United States going to tolerate this woman?

We seemed to have reached the desperation point and the madame's own family—at least her distinguished father—has given up on her.

Are we going to keep pouring economic aid into this nation without assurances that they want to join us in the common fight?

Are we certain that the money we are giving to South Vietnam is not paying for expensive hairdos in Rome and Paris?

She has also been pictured in the most expensive stores of the Western World, some of the same stores that have broke other national leaders.

And even more basic, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask how much of a hypocrite can a human being become? Those of us who have traveled to southeast Asia

and other parts of the world have been moved deeply by the continuing fight for bread that goes on; and by the general overall poverty that sickens the human personality. How can Madame Nhu continue to travel first class around the world and continue to criticize others? Why is she not home helping the needy of South Vietnam? She is a false pretender to a throne and a situation that is out of hand. It would be far better for her to cease immediately her wild spending binges and go back to the good earth where millions of her subjects are dying of poverty.

As a supporter of foreign aid programs, I am going to insist on answers to these questions. We cannot be engaged in a struggle which has already cost countless American lives and be insulted daily by one woman.

I know that the distinguished Ambassador, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., will do everything in his power to meet this situation in the most diplomatic manner and that he too has suggested the close watch on our economic aid during discussions in that country.

I simply want to say that as one who has been in the struggle to extend and improve our foreign aid program I am going to have a chance of heart in relation to economic grants to Vietnam until I can be assured that the American taxpayers' money is not being washed down the drain through the spending whims of one little woman whose country may very well be washed away by the surging tide of world communism.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, from time to time since the passage of the Landrum-Griffin Act in 1959, I have called attention to some of the more disturbing aspects of the performance of the National Labor Relations Board in its administration of those portions of the law for which it is responsible.

In purporting to carry out the intent of Congress, the performance of the NLRB has ranged from the dubious to the ridiculous. So sorry has been its record that only recently my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM], saw fit to introduce a bill to divest the NLRB of all jurisdiction in unfair labor practice cases and to repose that responsibility in the courts of the land. When one contemplates the shattering impact which recent NLRB decisions have had in almost every aspect of industrial relations, it is small wonder that the introduction of Mr. LANDRUM's bill has been enthusiastically hailed in all parts of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise now to focus the attention of my colleagues on a recent course of conduct on the part of the NLRB and its agents which raises new doubts about this Board and its capacity to function as a quasi-judicial body. The activity which I am about to reveal indicates either that the present Board

completely misapprehends its function or that it is determined to arrogate unto itself powers not contemplated by Congress.

I am reliably informed that during the last 3 months the Board and its agents have conducted a series of eight meetings with officials of certain AFL-CIO unions. In these meetings, which were held at various points throughout the country, participants discussed what they like and do not like about current Board policies.

I am informed that these meetings were arranged at the behest of the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO, and were attended for the most part by regional union officials principally concerned with organizational activities. I understand that the agenda of the meetings was concerned primarily with procedures, policies, rules and decisions of the Board in election cases as well as with proposals and recommendations advanced by the participating union officials.

Seven meetings devoted to such an agenda were conducted on a regional basis by NLRB personnel in the following cities: Atlanta, Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Houston, Los Angeles and Philadelphia. This series of regional meetings then culminated in a final meeting in Washington, D.C., which was attended by the members of the NLRB as well as by national officers of the unions involved.

Mr. Speaker, these were not public meetings. They were private meetings. There was no public announcement that such meetings were to be held. I understand that they were not formal meetings. Instead, they were conducted in camera on an "off the record" basis. It would be fair to assume, I am sure, that all Government employees who attended meetings away from their home stations did so at Government expense.

In order to keep the record straight, I want to make it clear that just recently the NLRB has also addressed a letter to certain business organizations, particularly the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, inviting them to participate in conferences at the national level to discuss with them, presumably on a similar basis, a list of topics ranging from subcontracting to free speech—a subject about which the current Board seems to know very little.

It is my impression that the meetings now scheduled with certain national business organizations are something of an after thought called in a belated effort to impart an aura of fairness and equal treatment. However, so far as I am concerned, if meetings with a selected few business organizations are conducted on a similar basis, they will be grossly improper and subject in every respect to the same criticism which I have leveled at the private meetings already held with selected union officials.

In the very nature of things—basic improprieties aside—it would be impossible for the Board, through such procedures, to accord fair and impartial treatment to all affected parties.

What about the small independent businessmen who are not affiliated with the NAM or the U.S. Chamber of Commerce? And who, at such a secret meeting, speaks for the public?

What about the nearly 50 million workers in America who do not belong to labor organizations? Who speaks for their rights in such secret meetings?

What about those workers who choose to belong to independent or other unions not affiliated with the AFL-CIO?

Within recent weeks, the Board's bias in favor of big league AFL-CIO unions and against smaller, independent unions has become increasingly apparent.

For example, last month, on September 12, the Board dealt a severe blow to an independent union while it continued on its way toward complete repeal of section 8(b)(7) of the Landrum-Griffin Act, adopted by Congress to control black-mail picketing. In *Alton-Wood River Bldg. Trades Council—144 NLRB No. 59*—the Board reversed its own trial examiner and held that certain picketing and boycott activities by AFL-CIO unions in Jerseyville, Ill., were legal and did not violate section 8(b)(7). The employees affected in that case were already organized and lawfully represented by Local 50 of the Congress of Independent Unions. However, despite the clear restrictions in the Landrum-Griffin law against picketing in such situations, the Board held that the picketing there may continue—presumably until the employers are forced to recognize the picketing AFL-CIO unions, and thereby deprive the employees of their preference for a union which does not happen to be affiliated with the AFL-CIO.

In another recent case, a bargaining contract between the Aerojet General Corp., of California, and the International Association of Machinists, AFL-CIO, had expired and an independent union—the United Missile and Aerospace Technicians—filed evidence of sufficient employee support and petitioned for an election. Shortly thereafter, the IAM and the company entered into a new contract. After sitting on the case for 8 months—hopeful perhaps that the independent union would lose its impetus—the Board, in precedent shattering decision, overruled its own regional director and refused to hold an election. This means that the employees there are locked into the AFL-CIO union—at least until the contract expires again, and are thereby deprived of any semblance of free choice as to who shall represent them—see *Aerojet-General Corp.*, 144 NLRB No. 42, issue September 3, 1963.

These very recent cases should serve to illustrate and emphasize that there are others in the ranks of labor besides the AFL-CIO who have important rights at stake when the NLRB holds secret meetings. And it is time that someone should speak up in their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, the National Labor Relations Board is an administrative tribunal with judicial functions. The Board was created by Congress to hear and decide cases by applying the laws as written and intended by Congress.

Under any circumstances, it would be somewhat irregular for a judicial body

17938

to call in organized pressure groups for advice and guidance as to the administration and interpretation of laws passed by Congress. But, surely if the Board feels the need for such assistance then, at the very least, such meetings should be public, they should be open to all, public notice should be given in advance, and all arguments or recommendations should be made on the record.

No arm of government with judicial functions should encourage or participate in—much less schedule and direct—private off-the-record meetings with any special interest group over whose activities it is required to pass judgment.

I submit that this new approach by the Board to the administration of justice is a far cry from the fundamental concept that each person is entitled to equal treatment and consideration under the law. Inevitably, such activities on the part of the Board lead to criticism and charges of favoritism which can only serve to undermine the peoples' confidence in their government.

It would be my suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that the NLRB issue a cease and desist order directed at itself and its agents and put an end to this type of activity.

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. BURKHALTER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MULTER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

AMENDMENT TO SHIPPING ACT OF 1916

(Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. BURKHALTER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation amending the Shipping Act of 1916 to require that the Federal Maritime Commission exercise to the fullest its authority to disapprove any rate or charge of any common carrier by water in foreign commerce, and of any conference of such carriers, which is detrimental to the commerce of the United States.

My amendment would make the validity of the rate depend on whether or not the rate is detrimental to the foreign commerce of the United States. Failure of the Maritime Commission to require that rates on our exports are competitive with our imports requires this legislation.

We are faced with a problem of substantial gold outflow, and a significant and continuing deficit in the imbalance of payments of the United States.

In 1949 the U.S. gold stock was \$24½ billion. That figure is down now to \$15½ billion and still falling—\$12 billion of this remaining \$15½ billion stock is frozen by the 1945 amendment to the Federal Reserve Act of 1914, so that remaining to meet our dollar commitments around the world are only \$3½ billion.

At this moment we owe the outside world in excess of \$25 billion, callable on demand of relatively short notice, in gold. We have lost \$395 million of gold so far this year. If our present rate of

loss continues, conceivably we could run out of gold sometime in late 1965.

In this climate a study by the Joint Economic Committee characterized the activity of the Federal Maritime Commission as "inadequate, shocking, disgraceful, and giving every indication that the Commission has been grossly negligent and gravely derelict in their duty to protect American industry, the public interest, and the U.S. national interest."

Specifically, the reason for the introduction of this legislation is the fact that ocean freight rates established by international shipping conferences are often from ports in the United States to North Atlantic European ports, and from our Pacific coast ports to Japanese ports, much higher on American exports than on American imports.

One of the major contributing factors to our unfavorable balance of trade is the higher conference rates for exports. Steel exported from the United States is an outstanding example. The Joint Economic Committee found that the rates on beams, angles, and girders in March 1962 were \$28.50 per ton on U.S. exports, but only \$19.75 on U.S. imports. On bolts the rates were \$31.25 per ton on exports, but were only \$24 on imports, for a difference against the American exporter of \$7.25 per ton. Conference rates on castings and forgings were \$44.25 on exports, but \$29.25 on imports, a difference of \$15. The difference of rates on screws was \$22, or 90 percent higher on exports than on imports.

In a table published by the Joint Economic Committee, on steel generally for three major trade routes one finds that ingots, blooms, billets, and slabs rates on exports were 86 percent higher than on imports; on wire rods, 71 percent; on structural shapes and pilings, 69 percent; on rails and accessories, 91 percent; on nails, 34 percent; on pipe and tubing, 45 percent; and on barbed wire, 37 percent.

For 1962 our exports of steel were only 2.1 million tons and imports were 4.3 million tons. It is fair to point out that

a large part of our steel exports are subsidized through foreign aid and defense support.

It costs less to send a Rolls Royce from England to the United States than it does to send a Chevrolet from the United States to England.

The cost of shipping a bicycle is as much as three times from the United States to Europe as from Europe to the United States. Cotton goods cost almost twice as much to ship from the United States to Europe as from Europe to the United States. In the case of shipments to Japan, a study of selected conference rates shows that the cost of shipments of angles, beams, and steel girders is \$31.10 from the United States to Japanese ports and inbound to the United States only \$15.50. Bolts and nuts cost \$33.25 to export and \$25.25 to import. Barbed wire costs \$36.60 to export and \$18.75 to import or about half of the export charge. Machine tools cost \$76.50 to export and \$45.50 to import into the United States.

Trucks shipped to Japan unboxed cost \$50.75 and inbound to the United States only \$23, a differential favoring the Japanese import over the U.S. export by 2 to 1. This discriminatory treatment of American industry and the American worker contributes heavily to our grave balance-of-payments problem.

For this reason I am asking for hearings at the earliest possible date on my legislation to force equity and fair play on the international shipping conferences—the steamship cartels of the world. For protection of the United States, its workers, and industry we must force a small measure of protection for the American dollar which is so much jeopardized by this kind of outrageous and discriminatory treatment.

The following table sets forth a series of rates sanctioned by the Federal Maritime Commission which are so out of balance with regard to carriage of imports and exports as to demand vigorous action by the Congress because of the failure of the Maritime Commission:

TABLE 1.—Comparison of conference ocean freight rates effective March 1962 on iron and steel products for 3 U.S. foreign trade routes

[Amounts in dollars]

Commodity	U.S. North Atlantic ports and West Germany ¹		U.S. Gulf ports and North Atlantic French ports ²		U.S. Pacific ports and Japan ³	
	Freight rate on U.S. exports	Freight rate on U.S. imports	Freight rate on U.S. exports	Freight rate on U.S. imports	Freight rate on U.S. exports	Freight rate on U.S. imports
Angles, beams, girders (structurals)...	31.25	19.75	28.50	17.00	28.10	15.50
Bolts.....	31.25	24.00	28.50	20.50	(4)	(4)
Castings and forgings.....	44.25	29.25	40.25	34.00	(4)	(4)
Billets and blooms.....	(4)	(4)	13.25	17.00	(4)	(4)
Ingots.....	36.75	19.75	33.50	(4)	28.25	15.50
Rods, wire, plain.....	29.50	18.25	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
Screws.....	46.00	24.00	(4)	(4)	30.35	21.00
Pipes, iron and steel, 6-inches in diameter.....	(4)	(4)	28.50	19.00	(4)	(4)
Wire, barbed.....	28.50	23.00	(4)	(4)	28.10	(4)
Bars, reinforcing up to 40 feet.....	(4)	19.75	(4)	(4)	33.60	21.00
Oil well castings.....	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	28.10	(4)
Shapes, plain, not fabricated.....	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	28.25	15.50
Rails.....	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)

¹ North Atlantic Continental Freight Conference tariffs.

² Gulf-French Atlantic Hamburg Range Conference-Continental-U.S.A. Gulf Westbound Conference.

³ Pacific Westbound Conference and Trans-Pacific Freight Conference of Japan.

⁴ Freight rate is either not available or the commodities are included in another class.

⁵ Not available.

NOTE.—Freight on exports on ton basis, 2,240 pounds; freight on imports on ton basis, 1,000 kilos = 2,204.6 pounds (except Japan where import freight is on the long ton basis, 2,240 pounds).

Source: U.S. Federal Maritime Commission, Division of Foreign Tariffs.